

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. 37.---No. 15.] LONDON, SATURDAY, OCT. 28, 1820. [Price, 6d.

I am compelled to postpone my *Sermon to the Methodists* for another week. I cannot let the Queen's affair receive a decision without one more attempt to support her righteous cause.

TO THE RADICALS,

On the probable close of the Queen's Incident.—And on the conduct of her Lawyers.

London, Oct. 26, 1820.

MY FRIENDS,

You will bear in mind, that I always regarded the affair of the Queen as an *incident* in the Grand Drama, of which the workings of the Funds, or Debt, is the *plot*: a great incident indeed; but still an incident: that is to say, a thing which might *assist* in producing the main event sooner than it would otherwise have come; just as a knock on the head may help out of the world a man perishing of a cancer; but, the absence of which knock in the head, or a failure in its effect, cannot save, or prolong, the life of the wretched being, whom the cancer has doomed to die. Therefore, we, who depend on the *plot*, have not placed any very great reliance, as to immediate effect, on *this*

incident; though it has been a capital thing, and has produced us a large mass of unmixed good. It has been a perfect "*God's send*" to us. It has been so much of *clear gains*. Let it terminate how it may, all that we justly detest is become more openly exposed, more odious, more contemptible and more loathsome than it was before. Divine Providence sent her Majesty here for our good; but she has been the instrument in that good; and she will always be an object of gratitude with me. When I kissed her Majesty's pretty little hand, I did it with real devotion; I blessed her in my heart, for having opened the eyes of so many poor blind people, and for having torn the mask from such swarms of villains and hypocrites, who will never again be able to impose on the credulity of mankind. She has done us wondrous service; and the man must be a wretch, who does not feel grateful towards her.

Perhaps the Lords will have decided before this Register will

come from the press; but, I may venture to *guess* at what they will do. That they will not *pass the Bill*, as it stands now, is, I think, evident. All the signs of that are too clear to be mistaken. But, yet, it is supposed, that they will do *a something*; and that that something will be of a kind to make it impossible for the Queen to be permitted to hold her courts, to live in a palace, and to be recognized *as Queen* in the *usual way*. In short, that a *vote of degradation* will be passed on her.

If the Bill were to be passed, with whatever modifications, it must *go to the House of Commons*, and it is evident, that there is a great dislike to send the Bill thither, and thereby revive the inquiry. By not passing the Bill, this renewed and long-continued struggle will be avoided. But, not to pass a *vote of degradation* would be to leave the Ministers to encounter the whole weight of royal, party and popular vengeance, without any thing to shelter them. Whether it be better to do this, or to leave to the king the honour of having for the remainder of his days a wife, standing degraded by a vote of the Peers, I leave others to de-

termine; but, at any rate, one or the other of these will now, according to all appearance, take place; for, it seems impossible that the Bill, as it now stands, should pass. And yet, what a situation will the affair and the parties be placed in by this expected vote of degradation? In the first place, there is the House of Peers, who have entered into and gone through an inquiry, which, terminate how it may, the House of Commons have declared to be derogatory from the dignity of the throne and injurious to the best interests of the nation! Then, there is a Queen, *degraded* by the House of Peers, and this Queen is not only the king's *wife*; but is his *cousin* also; is in the line of succession to the throne; and may possibly, and even probably, yet *come to the throne herself* and reign over the kingdom, though standing *degraded* by a vote of the House of Peers! Next comes the King, who, while the Peers vote his wife to be a degraded woman, unfit to hold courts and to be at the head of the females of England, is left to enjoy the honour of having that degraded woman for his wife; and, observe this, that, if

the divorce part of the Bill be rejected and the Queen degraded, the same assembly that degrades her, refuses to relieve him from her! And yet it does seem a little hard, that "our most religious and gracious king," as we devoutly call him every Sunday, in repeating the Liturgy, should be compelled to remain coupled to a wife, whom the Peers have degraded, and whose name has been thought unworthy of insertion in that same Liturgy! The "*morals of the nation*," to preserve which has been the professed object of this stir; these *morals* will, doubtless, have received great benefit from the detail of the evidence of *Demont* and *Barbara Krantz*, the latter elucidated by the High Dutch learning of the Right Reverend Father in God, Bishop Marsh. Doubtless the nation's *morals* will have received great improvement from the evidence of these two prying and sharp-sighted lasses, who, as SWIFT said of the diverting vagabonds (players) of his day, carried the matter as far as words could be of any use, and, like SWIFT'S vagabonds, "stopped short only of the actual performance of the

"thing." Nay, in the examination with regard to the exhibitions of *Leone*, or *Mahomet*, which the Attorney-General called "an imitation of the sexual intercourse," the witness was actually asked, whether she perceived any alteration in the shape of the operator's trousers! Doubtless, the nation's *morals* will have been, and will be greatly benefited by the book of evidence, printed by order of the Peers, after having been sent all over the country in sixpenny parcels; but, my friends, I greatly doubt, whether the purse of the nation will be much benefited by this book and the fillers of it. However, this is a matter for future observation; and, I have no hesitation in saying, that it is better for us to have our money bestowed upon the inhabitants of Cotton Garden, than upon placemen, pensioners, or Austrian soldiers. The thing will cost us a good deal; but, in this case, we shall have had something for our money: the three hundred thousand pounds, which I imagine, will be about the mark, will have been well laid out in obtaining so fine, so clear, so full an exposure of our deadly enemies.

We have talked so long about this Bill of Pains and Penalties, without having the Bill itself before us, that we almost forget what the thing really is. I shall, therefore, go back, to the origin of the proceeding, which will enable me the more clearly to explain the situation in which the parties are now placed. Let us bear in mind, then, that on the sixth of June last, the King sent a message to the Houses of Parliament, accompanying it with a green bag to each House, informing the Houses that the papers in the bag contained matter respecting the conduct of the Queen, and expressing his confidence that the Houses would adopt that course of proceeding, which "the justice of the case and the honour and dignity of his Majesty's Crown may require."

Now, it is material to observe, that the King, in this message, said not a word about the *morals of the nation*. He had only in view the *honour and dignity of his Crown*. On the next day, in the Lords, a motion was made to refer the Green Bag to a Secret Committee. Nothing was still said about the *morals of the nation*; but a great deal was said about

affording relief to the King. The Lord Chancellor, after having pointed out the difficulties of obtaining relief for the King, by impeachment, by civil action, or in the spiritual courts, observed that no one would say that the *King should have no relief at all*. Thus, then, at the outset of the business, *relief to the King*, and the support of the honour and dignity of the Crown, seem to have been the only things thought of. The idea of *preserving the morals of the nation*, by the instrumentality of De Mont, Powell, Brown, and Barbara Krantz, seems, at this time, not to have been engendered; for certainly it did not make its appearance.

The Secret Committee, when they had read the papers of the Green Bag, declared that the charges contained in it deeply affected the honour of the Queen, the dignity of the Crown, and the *moral feeling and honour of the country*! But this declaration took place on the fourth of July, that is to say, nearly a month after the date of the King's message; and after there had been, in Parliament and out of Parliament, a great deal said upon the subject of his Majesty's

being entitled to *relief*, in a case like the present. We next come to the Bill, which was brought into the House of Lords by Liverpool on the fifth of July. The Bill consists of a long preamble stating the offences of her Majesty, which preamble concludes with asserting that the Queen "has violated the duty she owed to his Majesty, and has rendered herself unworthy of the exalted rank and station of Queen Consort of this realm."

This preamble is all *talk*; but there follow a couple of stings in the tail of it, in these words: "I. That the Queen be, and is hereby, deprived of the title of Queen, and of all the prerogatives, privileges and exemptions, appertaining to her, as Queen Consort of this Realm, and be, from and after the passing of this act, for ever disabled, and rendered incapable of using, exercising and enjoying the same, or any of them.—II. That the marriage between his Majesty and the said Caroline Amelia Elizabeth be, and the same is hereby, from henceforth for ever, wholly dissolved, annulled, and made void to all intents,

constructions and purposes, whatsoever."

We have now something like a clear view of the matter. We see what was intended at the first, and also the grounds upon which the intention proceeded. In a short time after the Bill was brought in; or, at least, after the evidence in favour of it began to be produced, Liverpool declared that, as to the *divorce* clause, that was the least important part of the Bill. The *morals of the nation* were now put forward as demanding preservation through the means of this proceeding; through the means of the description of beds, sheets, and bolsters, given by the Countess Colombier, Barbara Krantz, and the rest of the Holy Catholic community of Cotton Garden.

But, now, at last, when all these strenuous efforts to preserve our morals are happily in our safe possession, there remain to be disposed of these two enacting clauses of this Bill. The *divorce* clause, that is to say, the second clause, is to be given up; or, at least, an intimation has been made to that effect. Well, then, observe that this will be a pretty sort of answer to the King's Message, in which

Message, he called for a something *required by the honour and dignity of his Crown*. How will the honour and dignity of his Crown be preserved by the rejection of this clause? For, mind, the clause must be *rejected*; which is a very different thing indeed from its never having been submitted to the House.

The next thing to be considered is, will the first clause pass the House? It might pass; and, thus, the Bill would be a complete Bill without the divorce clause. The Bill, in this shape, would unqueen the Queen; would leave her wholly destitute, not only of prerogatives and privileges, but would deprive her of all claim to maintenance of any kind or in any degree. It would actually turn her out to beg in the streets, unless maintained more comfortably by charity of another sort. It would, in fact, be degradation as complete as that of the son of Louis the Sixteenth, when the despotism had been abolished and when that youth had been bound apprentice to citizen Simon, the Cordwainer. Degradation more complete it is impossible to conceive; and if the Bill pass in this shape, it will serve as a prece-

dent for the degradation of a Queen, at least.

But, in this case, the Bill must go to the House of Commons; for, until it has passed that House, and until the King has given his assent, also, the Bill does not become a law; and, of course, it is only a parcel of useless words, and the Queen is not degraded. The House of Commons will finally pass the Bill, in my opinion, if the Lords pass it; and, it is possible, too, that they may pass it *without any examination of witnesses*. And, indeed, there is no good reason why they should not, supposing it to be a Bill proper for them to pass. The House of Commons cannot examine witnesses upon oath. They cannot come at the truth in the same way that the Lords can; and, if the testimony given before the Lords be laid before the Commons; there can be no reason why they should go over the evidence again except we could suppose it possible that the members could take delight in seeing the lips and hearing the sound of the voices of the Countess Colombier and Barbara Krantz.

It is possible, therefore, that the Bill may pass, with the exception of the divorce clause;

and if this take place, the Queen is degraded ; but whether this degradation will answer the purpose expressed in his Majesty's message, namely, *preserving the honour and dignity of the Crown*, is a question which I will leave you to determine.

There is another mode of proceeding, which would obviate any risk that there might be in passing the Bill without the divorce clause. That is to say, the House of Lords may set aside the Bill altogether, and come to a resolution or vote ; or may make an address to the King ; which vote, or address, should express, in the first place, that which is expressed in the preamble of the Bill, and should then express the opinion of the House, that the charges against the Queen had been proved, and that it was improper that she should be suffered to enjoy, or exercise, any of the rights, privileges or functions usually enjoyed and exercised by a Queen Consort.

This would, in some measure, screen the Ministers ; and it would also serve as a ground for refusing a royal residence and establishment to the Queen. It might be made the ground of

those and other measures of humiliation. But, still, it would fail in the main object which the Ministers must have in view ; namely, putting an end to the struggle ; for, instead of putting an end to that struggle, it would be sure to perpetuate it till there arose out of it something which the Ministers must desire to avoid. The rights, privileges and immunities, though checked in their exercise, would still *exist* ; they would still be an object of contention ; and, what would render the matter still more irritating would be, that the exercise would be prevented by the direct authority of the King, and that, too, without law, and even *against law*.

For my part, therefore, I can see no way out of the difficulties into which our pretty gentlemen have plunged themselves ; have plunged themselves of their own good will and pleasure, without any assistance of ours, and even contrary to our supplications and prayers ; and great fools we were for our pains for supplicating and praying to them, only, indeed, we were pretty certain, and I myself was quite certain, that whatever we prayed against they were sure to pursue with re-

doubled vigour! Their case is now past praying for. They never can bring themselves back to where they were on the 5th of June last. Pass the Bill or not pass the Bill, makes not a straw of difference to us; and, if I were to have my choice at this moment, I should, all the circumstances considered, have very great difficulty in saying which I thought best for the nation.

From the very beginning, it has been manifest that the Ministers, their supporters and abettors, wished to keep the Queen out of the country, in the first place, and afterwards to get her out of the country. How arduously, and yet how foolishly, they laboured to effect this object, we all recollect. It must be confessed, however, that they had something to contend with in their pursuit of this great object. If they were busy, others were not idle. When once the Queen was got *here*, it was not so easy to get her away. They had the cordial assistance of her law advisers; they had the assistance of Mr. Wilberforce and his associate deputies; they had an abundance of craft and cunning to aid them; and, at the time of that

deputation going to the Queen, success appears to have been so nicely balanced against defeat, that a straw would have turned the thing one way or the other. I call heaven to witness the anxious hours that I passed, between the making of Wilberforce's motion and the rejection of the advice contained in the resolution of the House of Commons. I remember a passage in Othello, I think it is:

"O! what damned minutes counts
he o'er,
"Who doats, yet doubts, &c."

I called this passage to mind at the time; and certainly Othello's ravings hardly came up to a full description of what I felt. No forlorn dog of a poacher, who, after groping about all night in vain, after fish, ever felt more anxiety when he, at last, felt the tail of a solitary eel slipping through his fingers, than I felt while Wilberforce, Auckland, Banks and Wortley, were going up in deputation to Portman Street. When the answer came to the House of Commons, I recovered my serenity a little; but I never felt perfectly at ease 'till the Green Bag was actually open, and the Report of the Secret Committee sent forth to the world. Then I

knew that all would follow which has followed; and I had a right to hope for as much more as I pleased, seeing that Sidmouth's Circular, and even the Six Acts, have not made it criminal to hope, especially if we keep our hopes within our teeth, as I have had the prudence to do.

When once the Green Bag was opened, actually opened, it could not be closed again. I feared no Lawyers from that moment; for one thing or the other must take place, either the Queen must go abroad with the vomitings of the Green Bag upon her, or she must stay here and combat her enemies, who, as it happened, were the enemies of us also. She could not do them harm without doing us good; and the feeling of the public was such as to make us hope for a result such as I have always prayed for, that is to say, a result greatly beneficial to the throne, as well as to the people.

Nothing will be accomplished, at last, to suit the views and to quiet the alarms of our pretty gentlemen, unless, by some means or other, **THE QUEEN CAN BE GOT OUT OF THE COUNTRY.** Mind, my friends,

this is the point. This is the thing which, above all things in the world, they desire: in their anxiety as to this matter, they forget, for a while, *Peel's* Bill, the howlings of the Merchants and the farmers, and all the other difficulties that are tumbling about them like hail.

To get her away: this is the thing that they have at heart; and yet, pretty gentlemen, how hard have they been working to prevent the possibility of getting her away! Divorce her and degrade her; nay, even fix on her the stigma of a vote; and how is she to go; where is she to show her face; where has she a friend on the face of the earth, but in England? In England, even if the Bill pass to its full extent, she will still have millions of friends. If no Bill be passed, and merely a vote declaratory of the opinion of the House that his Majesty ought to restrain her from the exercise of her rights, she will still possess those rights, and, while here, will be able to carry on a contest for them; but, out of the Kingdom she will go branded by the vote; she cannot, in the face of that vote, have a yacht or man of war to take her away; she can-

not be introduced as Queen of England at any foreign court; and, in the face of such a vote, how can our *faithful Representatives* vote away our money to enable her to live in splendour in a foreign land.

Thus the very means that the pretty gentlemen have been pursuing to destroy her, must tend to preserve her, for they must tend to keep her here, and here only can she possibly be sure of receiving even the means of putting bread in her mouth. It is, therefore, very difficult to say what is best, or what is worst; or rather, what is the least bad of the things that now may be done; but this I am very sure of, that, let what will be done, things never can be brought back to the state of the 5th of June last; and that this incident of the Queen will have given the system a blow, the effects of which it will feel to the last moment of its existence. The blow may yet be mortal; but, if it be not, it will be like one of those gun-shot wounds, which, though the ball be extracted and the mouth healed over, is always afterwards felt in company with every succeeding ailment, and goes gra-

dually on helping to accelerate final dissolution. For this reason, this whole nation ought to feel grateful towards her Majesty; and ought to do every thing in its power to assist her and support her under any and every circumstance.

Leaving, now, these wise men who have the business in hand, to pursue whatever measures they please, as to the disposal of the Bill, I proceed to remark upon the conduct of her Majesty's lawyers, meaning particularly to speak of those two dignitaries in the law, Messrs. Brougham and Denman. I have upon several occasions, had occasion to speak of this conduct. Their speeches in Parliament; their conduct with regard to the Protocols; their answers to the addresses from Nottingham and Preston, all these clearly proved that they wished to keep her aloof from all popular communication and support: that they wished her out of the country; and that, at any rate, even when the green bag was opened, they wished her to have no reliance but upon them.

It must now be evident to all the world what would have been the result, if the press and the people had not stepped for-

ward in her defence; and it must also be manifest that neither would have done it if the advice of those law advisers had been followed. But I am now going to speak upon the manner of conducting her Majesty's defence. The Ministerial papers say that the defence has broken down; and, as far as relates to the mere legal proceedings, it certainly has broken down, even without waiting to hear one word in reply from the Attorney-General. Never was so fine an opportunity for lawyers to display talent and zeal, and these two gentlemen have, upon this occasion, displayed neither. The opening speech of Mr. Brougham might have been made to work up a feeling people like the English almost to madness; instead of this, it passed over all the topics calculated to excite indignation against the enemies of her Majesty, and drawled itself along leaving the filthy slime of its praises upon the judges of the Queen, upon PITT, whose very name the people detested, and upon PERCEVAL, who, to his general demerits, added that of having deserted the Queen after he had made her the ladder of his ambition. There required

nothing but the telling of the plain story; there required nothing but a simple narrative of the persecutions of the Queen, in order to make it terrible to continue those persecutions for one moment longer; and yet, the speech of Mr. Brougham came to a driveling close with a supplication to her judges to uphold nobility, the ornament of the country; to save the Monarchy from the claws of the seditious, and to protect the altar from the unholy touch of blasphemers. The speech was, in fact, a speech against the interest of the Queen. It aimed at exalting those who are well known to be hostile to her, and at degrading those who are well known to be her friends. The Bill of Pains and Penalties charged her with having degraded herself by associating with inferior persons; and this speech took occasion to admit that she had so associated herself; and, of course, that she had thus been guilty of self-degradation. Was this the tone for an advocate to assume, and for an advocate, too, who had so strongly described the duties of his office, which, he had said, imposed upon him to become almost a traitor

tor to the King rather than lose sight of the defence of his client.

This speech was calculated to produce the worst possible impression. The falterings of fear became manifest within six sentences of its commencement. At a time when nothing should have dropped from his lips that did not breathe defiance, and anticipate triumph, all was humble, all was submissive, all was reliance upon the wisdom and justice of the judges: nothing was heard, but of the enormous difficulties under which the speaker laboured; the dreadful weight of responsibility upon his shoulders; the hardship of the unfortunate lady whom it was his duty to defend; and not a word about her cruel persecutors; about their atrocious proceedings; about her undaunted resolution to repel their attacks; and about his resolution to be amongst those who should perish by her side rather than see another act of injustice inflicted upon her. In short, the description of his client was sufficiently doleful to excite pity; and, perhaps, he thought that enough, forgetting that pity is the most short-lived passion that inhabits the human breast, and that, in the few cases where it

is not allied to contempt, it never leads to the inspiring of confidence of success to the pitied object.

In the conducting of the defence with regard to evidence, though a hundred objections could be made, I need mention only one instance; namely, that of neglecting to establish clearly the falsehood of the charges with regard to the polacre. It was very clear to every one who attended to the subject, that, if the facts could be established, that the Queen did actually sleep under a tent for the space of five weeks, and that her Chamberlain slept under the same tent for that five weeks, and that no other person slept there during that time; it was very clear that, if these facts were clearly established; and, that, if nothing was done to prove clearly the necessity of a man constantly sleeping under that tent; it was clear to every one that if these naked facts, without any explanation, were established, the fair and honest inference was, *that an adulterous intercourse did take place.*

Now, then, the master and his mate had sworn to these facts. This was the only part of the evidence against the

Queen, which presented any thing like difficulty; and the difficulty arose from the *bare fact* being true; and from the total disacquaintance of people in general with those circumstances, which, if properly explained, would destroy the inference naturally resulting from the fact. Tell any family of plain honest people, who have never been on board a ship, and who can have little more knowledge of the state of things there than they have of what is passing in the moon; tell such a family (and of such families the nation is composed); tell such a family that the master and mate of the vessel have positively sworn, that Bergami and the Queen slept both under the same tent, one upon a sofa, and the other upon a bed, every night, for five weeks, nobody else being under the tent, at the same time; tell such a family that such a fact has been positively sworn to in evidence against the Queen; then tell them, further, that this evidence has been confirmed by the Queen's own attendant, and one of her own witnesses, and a Lieutenant in the Navy, too; and further tell them that this acknowledgment has been

drawn from this latter witness by *cross-examination*: tell any honest plain English family this, and, in spite of all their strong feelings in favour of the Queen, they will say that the fair inference is, that there really was an adulterous intercourse carried on between the parties.

Here, then, there was something to defend the Queen against. All the stories about the disposition of chambers in dwelling-houses and at inns. All the signs and wonders and pretty little circumstances related by *De Mont, Majocchi, Sacchini, Barbara Krantz*, and the Journeymen Bricklayers. All these might have been left, with great safety, to be destroyed by the characters of those witnesses. But, besides this, their atrocious falsehoods were fully met upon every point but this, by the testimony of credible witnesses. But this polacre scene remained. The testimony, here, so far from being negatived, by other witnesses, was confirmed by the testimony of the Queen's own witness, and by that most zealous person, too, Lieutenant Hownam, who had sent a challenge to the pick-lock Baron.

Was it not, then, of vital im-

portance to prove, to the Court, and more especially to the people, that the description given of this affair was wholly deceptive; that it was made to appear before the public as being a thing wholly different from what it was; that, in short, the whole story was a lie in the words of truth; that it was a tent by name, and not a tent, in fact; that the parties did sleep under it, and yet that it was not two people sleeping under a tent; that though the Baron was under the tent with the Queen every night, it was absolutely necessary for him to be there, or for some man to be there, in order to secure her against broken limbs, and probably against being killed? Was it not necessary to do this; was not this a part of that bounden duty of which Mr. Brougham talked so much? And yet, what did this lawyer do, what attempt did he make, towards the performance of this most important part of his duty?

He had heard the swearings of the Queen's adversaries, as to this fact. He knew well the weight of the fact itself. He must have known that Hownam would be cross-examined with regard to it: he had abundant

opportunities for the space of nearly two months to question Hownam upon the subject; and yet he suffers the acknowledgment of Hownam of the truth of this fact, to be *drawn* out of him, as it were reluctantly, by a cross-examination! And he leaves it after his re-examination, almost in its pristine state of nudity, unexplained by any questions and answers showing the existence of that necessity for the Baron's being under the tent in the night-time, of which necessity Hownam must have been convinced, and to which he would have sworn clearly and positively.

Was this a matter to be left to the common-place drudgery of Mr. Vizard; was the leaving of this matter to the scrabbling of an attorney; was this shewing that true "*chivalrous*" spirit of which Mr. Denman speaks in the close of his two-days' tissue of feebleness? Hownam's head seems to have been confused enough. The "*blunt*" "tar," seems, indeed, in one sense, to have fully merited the epithet; but, if I had had such a fact to deal with, and had known that Hownam was to corroborate it, I would have planked him down to the same

table with myself; I would have got from him a description of this thing nick-named *a tent*; I would have stripped it of its name of tent pretty quickly; I would have made him tell me that it was made up of old sails, that it was fastened with strings to different parts of the ship; that it covered a space of *four hundred and fourteen square feet*; that the place of the Baron's bed was not probably *within sixteen or eighteen feet* of that of the couch of her Majesty; and that, in fact, he only slept, when he did sleep, *upon the same deck with the Queen*.

I would have had from him, or from somebody else, under his direction, a *plan* of the deck of the vessel, showing the situation of this thing nick-named a tent; shewing where the man at the helm stood the whole of every night; shewing where the binnacle was with the two lights burning in it constantly every night; shewing the station of the several persons of the crew during the night: describing the general station of the officer on watch; describing the hatchway going from the interior of this pretty little tent down into the cabin, or waist of the vessel; and, in short, leaving nothing

undescribed even to the precise situations of the couch of her Majesty and the pretended bed of her Chamberlain. Then I would have made him describe to me the dangers to which her Majesty was exposed from sudden squalls; from the violence of the waves, and from other accidents which are continually to be apprehended in such a situation. I would have got at a full knowledge of all his slang about *larboard* and *starboard*, about *heeling* and *pitching* and *tacking* and *wearing* and *reefing* and all the rest of the gibberish that trips so glibly off the tongue of a sailor; and that fills his head with conceit when he finds it not understood by persons on land. I would have caught him by the button and compelled him to talk to me in the language of this world. When he talked of *heeling*, I would have taken my pen, held it up before him, and made him describe to me in what degree the deck of the vessel was made to become a *slope* upon certain occasions; I would have made him shew me how nearly the Queen must have been in danger of being dashed across the deck every time the vessel took

a heel: I would have made him explain what the *shipping of a sea* meant; and I would have made him, even from his "*blunt*" lips, prove to the public, that the *shipping of a sea*, which might happen at any time of any night, might, without speedy assistance, have dashed her Majesty to the opposite side of the deck, if it had not sent her for ever beyond the reach of all her malignant persecutors.

This is a part, and a part only, of what I would have done with Lieut. Hownam before I would have placed him at the bar. If I could not have got plain common-sense answers out of his mouth, I would have confronted with him some one of the many thousands of intelligent merchants and supercargoes, who are in this city, and who have sailed in the Levant. I would have clearly understood all about the whole matter, and I would have made him understand very clearly, or, at least, quite clearly enough for the purposes of truth, what I wanted to extract from him.

Having done this; having satisfied myself that I had got proof of the necessity of some man being constantly upon the

deck near at hand to protect her Majesty; being prepared with my plan, I would have put the polacre scene in the very front of my case. I would have saved myself the trouble of making, and the Judges the time of hearing, a fulsome eulogium upon themselves, and a most false eulogium upon Pitt and Perceval; I would have gone at once into my case, and would have taken the polacre charge as a striking instance of the malignity, as well as the falsehood of the accusations against my client. I would have made this a substantive point in the opening of my defence. I would have had my plan in my hand; I would have minutely described every circumstance; I would have cited every corroborative proof of the truth of each circumstance; I would have explained the thing so clearly, that a farmer and his family, who had never seen a ship or a wave, should have comprehended the whole matter as clearly as I comprehended it myself; and before I had done, before I had dismissed this point, even in my opening speech, I would have put forth that which should have filled

the public with indignation against the prosecutors, and with admiration at the bravery of my client. Tears of compassion for her sufferings, mixed with those of joy at her approaching triumph, should have bedewed the cheeks, not of my *hearers*, perhaps, but certainly of my just and generous *readers*.

When I came to the production of my witnesses, the bungling Lieutenant should have been the *first*. I would have left the perjuries and amours of *De Mont*, and the rest of that tribe, to bring up the rear. My Lieutenant should have taken the lead, and I would have had such a harvest out of him, as to leave the Solicitor-General not a single ear to glean. I would not, as Mr. Brougham did, have run scrambling over the head of the crop, and left the clean reaper to come after me. Every doubtful thing; every thing to which suspicion could be made to attach; every particle of matter that had adhesion in it, would I have had out of him, or I would have left him without either brains or tongue. Mr. Brougham had known this Hownam long enough: he had had nearly four months of opportunity to talk with him. His evi-

dence was all-important. It related to things going on upon an element of which the people knew nothing; and was such a witness to be left to a mill-horse of an attorney, to a mere grinder of briefs!

This man's story, this "*blunt British tar's*" story, to Capt. Briggs, and which story, by the by, this other "*blunt British tar*" kept as safe and as snug as a pocket-pistol, and did not remind Hownam of it when Hownam went to see him a little while ago, though Hownam then asked him what evidence he had to give, and though the Captain could remember not to forget to relate the story to *Cockburn, one of the Lords of the Admiralty*! This man's story to Captain Briggs about his having *gone upon his knees*, and with *tears in his eyes*, to beseech the Princess not to take Bergami to her table; this story shows what a sort of man Hownam must be; and should not I, if I had been a sharp-sighted lawyer, like Mr. Brougham, have discovered what sort of a man he was; and, having made that discovery, should I have flung him down to be rummaged and raked and turned inside out by the Solicitor General? Should I

have brought such a man there, knowing what point he was to be questioned to, with nothing but the brief of Mr. Vizard in my hand, and without being prepared with the means, even of an efficient re-examination, after a cross-examination of three whole days!

In every case where great attention and great labour is required, an ounce of industry is worth a ton of brilliant talent; and, as Mr. Brougham possesses an extraordinary quantity of aptitude for labour, as well as an extraordinary quantity of talent, both brilliant and solid, the failure, as to this point, is the more inexcusable. Of what avail has been the poor feeble stuff of Mr. Denman upon this great point? Of what avail can be a few flimsy, pointless remarks, without order, and without any one single quality, calculated to encounter facts like those sworn to by the master and the mate, and fully corroborated by the testimony of

Hownam? Of what avail can these be, while the idea of a tent; of a snug tent; of a couch and a bed near each other, hidden from all eyes, quiet and secure, during five whole weeks; while these impressions remain unremoved; while the agitation of the vessel, the buffetings of the waves, the constant peril, the incessant danger of broken limbs, or of being washed overboard; while the interior of the tent remains looked on by the public as being as *level as a cham-* instead of being frequently as much a-slope as the *roof of a house*: as long as nothing is done, either in speech or in evidence, to remove these impressions, of what avail, or, rather, how directly mischievous, are all the innumerable proofs of the Queen and Bergami *sleeping in their clothes*! Oh! wise and zealous advocates! Just as if the affairs of love were never carried on except the parties were naked in a bed! SWIFT, in observing upon the admirable

judiciousness of the minds of lawyers, supposes a case wherein a cow has been unjustly taken from him by his neighbour; and he says, the questions on which the lawyers would lay the greatest stress, would be, not whether the cow really belonged to him, and had been unjustly taken away by his neighbour; but whether the cow were white or black; whether the field in which she fed were round or square; and whether she were a good milker or the contrary; and of this judiciousness in the practice of lawyers, Mr. Brougham's conduct with regard to the Polacre scene is a most happy illustration. A great deal about Bergami's dress. Most satisfactory proof that he did not sleep in buff. Testimony upon testimony that the Queen was never seen naked; and that Bergami was on no occasion seen without the covering of small-clothes; but, no attempt at all to make it out clearly and satisfactorily

that his being under the awning, nick-named a tent, during the night, was absolutely necessary to the safety of the person of the Queen; though, as we shall finally see, whatever may be done by the House of Lords, hostile to her Majesty's honour, will mainly rest upon the want of proof of that necessity!

If this part of the case had been well and truly attended to and carried through, there would not have remained the fragment of a pretence for saying that any part of the preamble of the Bill had been made good. There are, however, other things which have been omitted. Why were not the witnesses called to give proof respecting the character of Barbara Krantz? Why was not the witness called who went to Carlton-house with Majocchi? Why were not witnesses called (and plenty were at hand) to prove that the Master and Mate had been

in England with their vessel after their sailing with the Princess, and that they always spoke of her in the highest terms of praise, and declared their opinion, that the rumours in circulation against her were false?

Why was not Count SCHIAVINI called, who was on board the polacre? He could have talked plain common sense, if a slang-gabbling sailor could not. He could have described the danger of a woman sleeping upon such a deck without a man at hand to assist her. Why was not the Countess of Oldi called? Why was not Louis Bergami called? and, finally, *why not the Baron himself!*

Upon this latter point, I have always been of an opinion different from that of some of the real friends of her Majesty. I expressed that opinion from the moment of her arrival; not only in private, but in three separate Registers. I do not say, that actually to call him to the bar would have had much effect in

the way of *testimony*: Yet his presence would have been greatly favourable to the cause of the Queen. He would have been there in person; and that person, of itself, together with his deportment and manners, would have been the bitterest of reproofs to the calumniators of her Majesty. It would have been seen that he was a man of rare endowments and qualities. In his person and manners would have been seen a presumptive proof of his fitness for the situation which he had so long and so honourably filled.

In the very phraseology of Mr. Brougham and Mr. Denman, there has been something tending to do great injury to the cause of their Royal Client. In speaking of this gentleman they have talked about "*that man*," "*that person*," and never have called him by any name other than that of *Bergami*; just as they would talk of *Vickary* or *Cribb*! They should have left the pro-

secutors and their malignant agents to talk in this way. They should never have spoken of him without calling him the *Baron Bergami*, or the *Queen's Chamberlain*. When the object of the enemy was to *lower* him in the eyes of the nation, they should have taken care not to assist in the furthering of that object. What would they think if any one were to call Sir JOHN ELBY, Lieutenant-Colonel of the Royal Horse-Guards, "*Jack Elby, the pot-boy?*" yet Sir John's mother really kept the *Furnival's Inn Cellar*, a low pot-house between Leather-lane and Brook-street; and Sir John began his career, just as the Baron did; that is to say, as a Quarter-master in a regiment of horse. What would they say, were we to trace back a considerable portion of the long robe themselves to beer cellars and chandlers' shops, and were to call Mr. GURNEY, who is a King's Counsel, and Attorney-General

to the Society for the Suppression of Vice, the son of an old woman who kept one of the lowest pamphlet shops that ever was known in London?

It became the advocates of the Queen to adopt, as far as possible, even the very feelings of their client. It was their bounden duty to dwell with particular emphasis on the services and endowments of this gentleman. They should have had at hand, and running glibly off their lips, a long list of men distinguished for talent filling high stations, wearing the highest honours, select companions of Sovereigns, rising from the very lowest walks in life. What a figure might they have made here! Almost the whole of our celebrated writers, a very large portion of our most famous lawyers and judges, generals and admirals, they might have traced back to the shop or the cottage. Here was a subject perfectly inexhaustible. The low origin of the Chamberlain

stood staring them in the face in the very first paragraph in the Preamble of the Bill against which they were contending; and while, by a statement such as I have just pointed out, they might have made the authors of the Bill hang down their heads, to the very lodging of the chins upon their breasts, they resorted to poor puling apologies and more pitiful lamentations than their client, in consequence of having been deserted by the English nobility, that first society in the world, had been compelled to take up with persons beneath her! This might be a very good way of currying favour for themselves, but it was the worst way in the world of defending the Queen; and it very badly comported with that flaming declaration of Mr. Brougham, that an advocate was bound to sacrifice himself, nay, even to sacrifice his own reputation, if necessary, to the defence of his client.

Low birth, indeed! How the

farmers of this charge might have been complimented!—Would I have suffered it to pass without a compliment to the merits of the coal merchant's son who sat upon the Wool-sack? Would I have suffered it to pass without reminding the noble Peer, *who brought in the Bill*, of the merits of his own father, who had once been a very humble personage, indeed, in the House of Lord Bute, who had been a reviewer of books, and paid for his writing as a reviewer, and who had had the great merit of rising to a Peerage and riding in a coach with a coronet on it, after having many and many a time, gone from London to Litchfield on the outside of the coach with his pint of good warm *purl* in his belly? Would I have said nothing of this sort? Would I not even have glanced at those meritorious personages, the M'Mahons, the Addingtons, the Cannings, the Huskissons, and that great constellation of ta-

lent, the Right Honourable Sir Benjamin Bloomfield, Baronet, whose uncle is an industrious baker in Wapping! Would I have done nothing of this sort? Would I have stood staring like a stuck pig and heard my Royal Client abused for taking the *Courier, Bergami*, to her table; and, when it came to my turn to speak, assume a pitiful aspect, a plaintive tone, and the miserable self-convicting language of *apology*!

I have, as I said before, always thought it wrong that the Baron did not come over with the Queen. The advice which prevented it was, I am very certain, the offspring of sincere friendship to her Majesty. It was, too, I dare say, the offspring of reflection; but, of reflection not carried far enough. *The Queen came to face her enemies*; and, above all the persons upon earth, the Baron should have come with her. All this dirty talk about the *Courier*; about *Bergami*, about

a man standing behind her chair; all this despicable rubbish; this calumny, in apparently insignificant words, would have been dissipated at once. The very presence of the man would have been an answer to the preamble of the Bill.

There was, too, an appearance of something looking a little too much like *shyness*, in keeping the Baron from the scene. There could be no good reason for it. It seemed to be a step, for which there was no accounting; and, as it is always the best way, to correct an error as soon as possible after it be committed, the Baron *ought to come now*. It is never too late to correct that which is wrong. I dislike the circumstance of the Baron's being kept at a distance; I dislike it for many reasons; but I dislike it most, because it is *unnatural*; because her Majesty must, of necessity, act, in this case, against the dictates of her inclination. It is unquestionable

that she has great confidence in the Baron, that she has preferred him before all other men, as an attendant upon her person; and we know that he has been six years in her service. It is, therefore, unnatural that her other foreign servants should be with her, and that he should be kept away. I could see no reason from the beginning for this measure; and I see every reason that can be imagined for speedily putting an end to this species of banishment.

It is false reasoning that can lead any one to the conclusion, that the national prejudice against foreigners would have any weight with the people in this case. That prejudice is not a prejudice against *individuals*; nor, indeed, is it ever, in any case, a prejudice of a *hostile* nature. It is a haughty, domineering sort of spirit, that makes this nation look upon all other nations with a species of disdain and contempt; nor can I, though I am perfectly impartial in my

judgment, say, when I look at this country, and compare it, taking it all together, with the countries on the Continent, that this disdain and contempt is wholly unjust. But, the people of this country have no prejudice against *individuals* of other countries; and it would be a pretty thing, indeed, to take an objection to the Queen's continuing to employ her Chamberlain, merely because he is a *foreigner*, while the King's own regiment of cavalry is actually commanded by a foreigner, and that, too, *directly in the teeth of the law*; whereas the Queen's employment of the Baron would violate no law at all. This Commander of the King's Regiment, as another instance of sudden elevation from low birth and station, was a *private soldier* only a few years ago. He *rode* to please the Prince. He became a *riding master*; and now he is the first Lieutenant Colonel of the 10th Regiment of Dragoons; and in that station, he is,

I repeat it, in direct opposition to the very letter of the law. It were a pretty thing, indeed, while things like this exist (and many such do exist) to pretend a prejudice against the employment of *foreigners*! It were a pretty thing, indeed, to talk of this, while we are actually paying about two hundred thousand pounds a year, under the name of *half pay to foreign military officers*, who live and spend the money out of the country; and is there any one so divested of all sense of shame as to trump up an objection to the Queen's continuing to employ her Chamberlain, because he is a foreigner, when it is well known that we have been taxed to the tune of millions upon millions for the maintenance of *foreign emigrants*; and while we, even to this hour, are paying more than *fifty thousand pounds a year* for the support of those emigrants, after having buried ourselves in debt for the purpose of restoring the governments of those emigrants?

Away, then, with all the rubbish about prejudice against foreigners. It is a paltry pretence for keeping from the Queen, the man in whom she has so long, and so naturally, and, indeed, so successfully confided. I would have had him at the bar. I would have had him to follow the Queen to the House of Lords. I would have suffered nothing to wear the appearance of *shyness* upon this score; and I am perfectly satisfied that her Majesty's better judgment would have avoided all such appearances. It had, I must repeat it, an ill look; and especially when Count Vassali and Schiavini came, and when even the sister of the Baron came over. What reason could there be for his not coming? It is utterly impossible that the Queen, who had so justly bestowed on him such great marks of favour, could desire now to cast a sort of reproach upon him; to banish him, as it were, from her presence. This is impossible. Every

one will say that this is impossible ; and, therefore, to remove the possibility of any lurking suspicion ; to remove the possibility of an imputation of a consciousness of something wrong, he should have been here in preference to every other foreigner.

At any rate, he ought to come now. He ought to be seen by the people ; and especially ought he to be here if the Bill, or any part of the Bill, should pass. The Attorney and Solicitor General have called, and they will call, most lustily for the Baron and his brother, and, if I were in the Queen's place, please God, they should not call in vain ! I would have them here, and I would take an airing occasionally in every one of the Parks, having the Baron for my principal attendant. " Love me, love my dog," though blunt in words, is a maxim dictated by honest nature and sanctioned by the approbation of all ages. I would say to any man, if you

wish me to be ungrateful as the price of your attachment and support, keep your attachment and support for your own service.

But, there is another witness, who was not called, and, indeed, whose name never ought to have mentioned in the opening speeches of the defence ; namely, *the sister of De Mont*. I was astounded when Mr. Brougham pledged himself to call this person as a witness. Did ever a thought such as this before come into the mind of an advocate ? The *sister of De Mont* ; the sister of the Countess de Colombier ; the sister of the Shepherdess of Frith-street ; the sister of the *bonne amie* of Whitcomb ; the sister of her whom the Queen had turned from her service on account of her intrigues, and of which turning away the Baron had been the instrument ; the correspondent of the writer of *double entendres*, the sister of her with whom Powell was proved to be

living in sweet and uninterrupted friendship. Could Mr. Brougham believe that there was a wall as high as heaven between Frith-street and Brandenburg House, or could he believe that any other means which God or man could invent would keep the *naïf* Shepherd from communicating with the sister of the Countess? Could he believe that there was any mode of communication that would remain untried? Could he believe that there was no one to slide into the house with a letter? Had he taken care to surround the house with guards, to have the doors locked and bolted, as safely as that of Demont at Naples? Had he stopped all the key-holes? Had he placed an inspector of milliners' ban-boxes, and of match-sellers' baskets and of the patches on beggars' eyes? Had he, in short, found out a some thing with more eyes than Argus to watch all the numerous channels between Frith-street

and Brandenburg House? If he had not, and if he did not see a wall surrounding Brandenburg House, reaching from the ground to the sky, to call, as a witness in defence of the Queen, this sister of the noble Countess, the sentimental journalist and the *tete a tete* acquaintance of the *son of Quachi*, would have been the maddest thing, or the most treacherous thing, ever done by mortal man.

He was not guilty of this most flagrantly wicked act; but why then did he *talk* of bringing this sister as a witness? Why did he *positively declare*, that he would do it? Why did he give his adversaries this fair ground for taunting him with his *apprehensions*? Why did he thus wantonly expose himself and injure his client?

However, to dwell further upon particulars I have neither room nor time. The great sin of the defence is, the negligence with regard to the scenes on

board the polacre. Upon those scenes ; upon the evidence with regard to them, the result will exclusively turn. Take "*the tent* ; " take this thing, nicknamed a tent, out of the case, and you take away the possibility of finding any thing like a plausible pretence, any thing like a colour of a pretence, for passing any part of this Bill.

I have just got a glimpse of the speech of Dr. Lushington. In that, indeed, there is something to the purpose ; there are some *points*, and those points well and clearly stated. But, it is the *evidence* that is deficient. How much better would it have been, if the labours which I have described above, had been previously performed ! In such a case as this, nothing should have been left doubtful, and especially when it required nothing but skill and labour to make every thing clear and satisfactory. The far greater part of the judges themselves can have no clear conception of the constant dangers to which her Majesty was exposed while sleeping on the deck, and, of the consequent necessity of having some active man always at hand. Could I not have found the means *out of the thirty thousand pounds* which Messrs. Brougham and Denman have caused to be drawn out of the public treasury for purposes connected with the Queen's defence ; could I not have found the means, out of these thirty thousand pounds, to provide myself with a *complete model* of the Polacre, from the top gallant mast to the keel, "*tent*" and all ? With this model in my hands, it being four or five feet in length, could I not have exemplified the necessity for which I was contending ? Could I not have made the witnesses exhibit before their lordships the movements of the *pitching* and the *heeling* of the ship ? Could I not have shown the point for which I was contending in so

clear a light as to make any man ashamed to think of pronouncing guilt upon the circumstances relating to the co-existence of the Queen and her Chamberlain under that "*tent*?" And, when I saw, as Mr. Brougham must clearly have seen, that there would remain not a fragment of the adversaries' case undestroyed, if this were destroyed, ought I to have slept night or day, 'till I had destroyed this part of their case?

Before I dismiss this subject, and wait for the reply of the Attorney and Solicitor-General, I cannot help observing on two things: first, Mr. Brougham's often repeated, and never executed, *threat of recrimination*. This threat was, he stated in his opening speech of the defence, to be resorted to only in case of *necessity*. Of what that necessity was to consist, or by what circumstances or symptoms it was to be evinced, he did not inform us. It is, how-

ever, fair to conclude; and, indeed, such is the necessary conclusion, that he meant to exercise the threat of recrimination with a view of rendering service to the cause of his client. There might, during the defence, arise circumstances which would amount to this necessity of recrimination. For instance, the sending away of Rastelli; the compliments paid to Powell, who had sent him away; Powell's having taken him out of the locked-up and guarded depot, of his own head, of his own mere motion; and having obtained for him a passport, *signed by Castlereagh, without Castlereagh's knowing it*; the refusal to go on with an inquiry into the conspiracy carried on at Milan and elsewhere. These might have been circumstances to create that dire necessity, of which Mr. Brougham talked, of going into the recrimination. Yet it seems that they had no such effect! for the defence has been begun, continued and end-

ed, and not a syllable have we heard about the recrimination!

This recrimination appears to be a *good thing* that Mr. Brougham is *treasuring up* for some important purpose, though it is very difficult for us plain people to perceive how it can now possibly be used *for the benefit of her Majesty*, while it is not quite impossible, if we were to set our wits to work, for us to form a conjecture as to the use of which it may possibly be made *for the benefit of others*. Whether Mr. Brougham will ever make any use of it in his life time, or whether he will leave it as a "*legacy*," as he told us PITT left the cause of the Princess to PERCEVAL; whether he look upon it as a possession of his own; or whether he only partly enjoy it, as a sort of corporator; whether it be a possession in fee; or whether it be held in trust: these are questions which I shall not, at present, take upon me to answer. *Time*, and, probably, a *short time*, will elucidate a mat-

ter, which is certainly now involved in a great deal of mystery.

Leaving this, therefore, for the present, to engage the speculations of my readers, I shall conclude this long, and, I fear, tiresome letter, by observing, that Mr. Brougham ought to have summed up the case *himself*; and not have left it to Mr. Denman. I am aware that *etiquette* claimed the honour for this latter; but, according to Mr. Brougham's own doctrine, the advocate is to sacrifice even himself and his reputation to the safety of his client; and surely, then, there might have been a sacrifice of *etiquette*. I have no disposition to criticise harshly the efforts of Mr. Denman. But I have a duty to discharge myself; and I cannot look at this two days of talk; of poor, feeble, disjointed, drawled-out observation, without feeling indignant at Mr. Brougham for not having undertaken the task himself. There required, upon

this occasion, clearness, strength and fearlessness. There did not require an exordium of fulsome compliment to the Judges and the adversaries of the Queen; but there required a *regular and judicious classification of the charges*. That, the want of which was complained of by Mr. Brougham, with regard to the Bill of Pains and Penalties, ought to have been found here. Here ought to have been found a list of those very charges, of which no list would be furnished by the adversary. These charges ought to have been stated distinctly, one after the other; *first, second, third, fourth*, and so on to the end. Then I would have begun with all the evidence relating to the first charge. I would have stated it neatly, clearly, as briefly as possible. I would not, like Mr. Denman, have begun my sentences at the wrong end. All the evidence against me should have come first. Then the evidence for me.

Then the characters of the witnesses, and their probable or proved motives. In my analysis of this evidence, I would have been clear and strong, pointed, and, I trust, convincing. And, having thus dispatched one charge, I would have gone to the next.

Was not this the mode of proceeding, which even common sense pointed out? Who is to carry along in his mind the former part of a defence, when there is such chopping about, such skipping backwards and forwards; such repetitions; such a mass of confusion? Speechifying, quotation of evidence, analysis of evidence, flights of fancy, statements of facts, appeals to the passions, all mixed up together pell-mell! Who, amidst such a mixty-maxty of matter, is to arrive at a rational conclusion? The charges should have been kept distinct; regularly enumerated, discussed under separate heads; each brought to a close

ed, and not a syllable have we heard about the recrimination!

This recrimination appears to be a *good thing* that Mr. Brougham is *treasuring up* for some important purpose, though it is very difficult for us plain people to perceive how it can now possibly be used *for the benefit of her Majesty*, while it is not quite impossible, if we were to set our wits to work, for us to form a conjecture as to the use of which it may possibly be made *for the benefit of others*. Whether Mr. Brougham will ever make any use of it in his life time, or whether he will leave it as a "*legacy*," as he told us PITT left the cause of the Princess to PERCEVAL; whether he look upon it as a possession of his own; or whether he only partly enjoy it, as a sort of corporator; whether it be a possession in fee; or whether it be held in trust: these are questions which I shall not, at present, take upon me to answer. *Time*, and, probably, a *short time*, will elucidate a mat-

ter, which is certainly now involved in a great deal of mystery.

Leaving this, therefore, for the present, to engage the speculations of my readers, I shall conclude this long, and, I fear, tiresome letter, by observing, that Mr. Brougham ought to have summed up the case *himself*; and not have left it to Mr. Denman. I am aware that *etiquette* claimed the honour for this latter; but, according to Mr. Brougham's own doctrine, the advocate is to sacrifice even himself and his reputation to the safety of his client; and surely, then, there might have been a sacrifice of etiquette. I have no disposition to criticise harshly the efforts of Mr. Denman. But I have a duty to discharge myself; and I cannot look at this two days of talk; of poor, feeble, disjointed, drawled-out observation, without feeling indignant at Mr. Brougham for not having undertaken the task himself. There required, upon

this occasion, clearness, strength and fearlessness. There did not require an exordium of fulsome compliment to the Judges and the adversaries of the Queen; but there required a *regular and judicious classification of the charges*. That, the want of which was complained of by Mr. Brougham, with regard to the Bill of Pains and Penalties, ought to have been found here. Here ought to have been found a list of those very charges, of which no list would be furnished by the adversary. These charges ought to have been stated distinctly, one after the other; *first, second, third, fourth*, and so on to the end. Then I would have begun with all the evidence relating to the first charge. I would have stated it neatly, clearly, as briefly as possible. I would not, like Mr. Denman, have begun my sentences at the wrong end. All the evidence against me should have come first. Then the evidence for me.

Then the characters of the witnesses, and their probable or proved motives. In my analysis of this evidence, I would have been clear and strong, pointed, and, I trust, convincing. And, having thus dispatched one charge, I would have gone to the next.

Was not this the mode of proceeding, which even common sense pointed out? Who is to carry along in his mind the former part of a defence, when there is such chopping about, such skipping backwards and forwards; such repetitions; such a mass of confusion? Speechifying, quotation of evidence, analysis of evidence, flights of fancy, statements of facts, appeals to the passions, all mixed up together pell-mell! Who, amidst such a mixty-maxty of matter, is to arrive at a rational conclusion? The charges should have been kept distinct; regularly enumerated, discussed under separate heads; each brought to a close

before the speaker had proceeded to another. This was the way to produce a strong and suitable impression upon the Judges; and, which was of full as much importance, upon the attentive and anxious nation.

When this had been done, very little remained to be done in the way of appeal to the justice of the Judges. Here, however, was the proper occasion for stating the case of her Majesty, including the conduct of her husband towards her; for this is a bill of *divorce*, call it what else they will; and here the whole history of the conduct of the husband ought to have been fully and boldly stated; and the only argument which ought to have been attempted, in order to induce the Judges to act agreeably to what had been proved, was, that they were bound to act by their duty towards their country, as well as their duty towards the throne.

Instead of this, what have we by way of conclusion, from this defender of the Queen? I am almost ashamed to cram up my pages with any part of this, at once, feeble and swaggering effort of Mr. Denman; but, that the whole of the press, in a lump, may not be accused of participating in winking at this instance of imbecile loquacity, I feel myself called upon to insert the close of this everlasting harangue, which was in the following words. "I have heard it said, that a spirit of mischief was actually at work, among the friends of her Majesty; but the same person

" who uttered that memorable
" expression, in a few weeks
" was obliged to admit that it
" was false, because the truth
" could not be concealed, that
" the whole of the generous popu-
" lation of England had enlisted
" themselves with ardour on the
" side of the innocent and the
" injured. At the same time,
" it is possible that *both may be*
" *true*; the *sound and middling*
" *classes* of society may feel
" acutely for the situation of
" her Majesty; and there may
" be, also, *some apostles of mis-*
" *chief lurking in a corner*
" *meditating a blow at the Con-*
" *stitution*, and ready to avail
" themselves of any opportuni-
" ty for open violence. If that
" be so, the generous sympathy
" to which I have alluded would
" be aggravated by a verdict of
" guilty; while *those mischiev-*
" *ous and disaffected men* would
" deprecate nothing half so
" much as to see your lordships,
" in the face of the power of
" the Crown, venturing to pro-
" nounce a *verdict of acquittal*
" for a defendant so prosecuted.
" I trust your Lordships will not
" allow the idea of having *fear*
" *imputed to you* to divert you
" from the straight course of
" your duty; it would be the
" worst of injustice to the ac-
" cused, and the worst of cow-
" ardice in yourselves. I say,
" therefore, if your own minds
" are satisfied that all that has
" been proved has been scatter-
" ed *'like dew-drops from the*
" *lion's mane,* you will never
" hold yourselves justified in
" pronouncing a verdict con-
" trary to the evidence, be-

"cause your conduct may be
 "imputed to the dread of a
 "mob; or, to use the jargon of
 "the day, which I detest, the
 "apprehension of a radical at-
 "tack. You have but one
 "course to pursue, and that
 "course is straight forward; it
 "is to acquit her Majesty at
 "once of those odious charges.
 "We may truly say, that as
 "there never was such a trial,
 "so there never existed such
 "means of accusation. Before I
 "conclude, I must be permitted
 "to say, that during the whole
 "of this proceeding (though
 "personally I have every rea-
 "son to thank the House for its
 "kindness and indulgence) the
 "highest gratification resulting
 "to my mind has been, that
 "with my Learned Friend I
 "have been joined upon *this*
 "*great occasion*. We have
 "*fought* the battles of morality,
 "Christianity, and civilized so-
 "ciety throughout the world;
 "and, in the language of the
 "*dying warrior* I may say,

"In this glorious and well-foughten
 field

"We kept together in *our chivalry*."

"While he was achieving the
 "*immortal victory*, the illustri-
 "ous triumph, and protecting in-
 "nocence and truth, by the ada-
 "mantine shield of his *prodigi-*
 "*ous* eloquence, it has been my
 "lot to discharge only a few
 "*random arrows* at the de-
 "feated champions of this dis-
 "graceful cause. The House
 "will believe me when I say,
 "that I witnessed the display of
 "his *surprising faculties* with
 "no other feeling, than a sin-
 "cere gratification that the

"triumph was complete; and
 "admiration and delight, that
 "the victory of the Queen was
 "accomplished. This is an in-
 "quiry, my Lords, unprece-
 "dented in the history of
 "the world: the down-sitting
 "and up-rising of this Illus-
 "trious Lady have been sedu-
 "lously and anxiously watched:
 "she uttered no word that had
 "not to pass through this se-
 "vere ordeal. Her daily looks
 "have been remarked, and
 "scarcely even her thoughts es-
 "caped the unparalleled and
 "disgraceful assiduity of her ma-
 "lignant enemies. It is an inqui-
 "sition, also, of a most solemn
 "kind. I know nothing in the
 "whole race of human affairs,
 "nothing in the whole view of
 "*eternity*, which can even re-
 "motely resemble it; but the
 "*great day* when the secrets of
 "all hearts shall be disclosed!

"He who the sword of Heav'n will
 bear

"Should be as holy as severe!"

"And if your Lordships have
 "been furnished with powers,
 "which I might almost say
 "*scarcely Omniscience itself*
 "*possesses*, to arrive at the se-
 "crets of *this female*, you will
 "think that it is your duty to
 "*imitate the justice, beneficence,*
 "*and wisdom* of that *benignant*
 "*Being*, who, not in a case like
 "this where innocence is mani-
 "fest, but when guilt was detect-
 "ed, and vice revealed, said—
 "'If no accuser can come for-
 "ward to condemn thee, nei-
 "ther do I condemn thee: GO,
 "AND SIN NO MORE.'"

There! ye professors of bung-
 ling, bombast and egotism,

match that if you can! I care not who you are, or how numerous: come all of you, from the four quarters of the globe; even bring Castlereagh and lawyer Phillips amongst you; and match that if you can! Passing over, however, the two heroes who go off in the language of the "dying warrior;" barely looking at the two men in their great big-big-wigs, parson's bands, and long black gowns; barely looking at them and hearing them describe themselves as keeping together in their *chivalry*, in this *well-foughten field*; passing over the *prodigious eloquence*, the *surprising faculties*, and the *immortal victory*, with which one be-plasters the other, at the same time that he claims a full partnership in the concern; passing over the idea of a battle fought by these heroes for *morality*, *Christianity*, and *civilized society throughout the world*; passing over also, the immediately succeeding adulatory blasphemy, comparing the approaching decision to that of the great judgment, and putting the power of the judges nearly upon a level with that of the Almighty himself; passing over these things, there is an *argument* to notice here, and, as it had the most important place assigned to it, it is worthy of notice.

Mr. Denman asserts, or takes it for granted, it having been asserted by others, that the *sound and middling classes* of society feel acutely for the situation of the Queen, and

that there are *some apostles of mischief*, lurking in a corner, meditating a blow at the Constitution, and ready to avail themselves of any opportunity for open violence. Now, though this is as false and as malignant and as base as any thing that has been done or attempted against her Majesty; though it is a poor creeping, crawling, sycophantic sacrifice made to the upholders of the system by which Mr. Denman hopes to thrive: though this is manifest, do not, my friends, trouble yourselves with the falsehood of the fact, or with his motives for uttering the falsehood. Confine yourselves to his *argument*. Here, then, he says that there are two bodies, the sound and the mischievous. That the sound are very numerous and wish the Bill not to pass. That the mischievous lurk in a corner, and that they wish the Bill to pass, in order that they may get at their game of mischief. Now, supposing the Lords to be influenced by the *dread of having fear imputed to them*, who are we to suppose they would be most likely to fear; the *numerous sound class*, or the *apostles of mischief lurking in a corner*? The former class, to be sure; for, if fear be imputed to them, the fear must necessarily arise from the expected displeasure of the sound body, the middle ranks of society; and, therefore, if they act upon the dread of having fear imputed to them, they must *necessarily pass the Bill*; because nobody can suppose it possible for them to be

actuated by fear of offending the "some apostles who lurk in a corner." Thus, then, here is as good an argument for passing the Bill as one could possibly expect to come from the lips of so confused and feeble a reasoner. And this is to be ascribed purely to his desire to evince his enmity to the "apostles lurking in a corner," and his desire to prove his servility to those who are most anxious to keep down those apostles; in his eagerness to gratify which double desire he blundered into an invocation to the Lords to condemn the person, to make every sacrifice to obtain whose acquittal was his bounden duty.

But, if this is calculated to excite a mixture of astonishment and contempt, what are we to say of the concluding sentence of all; where, having placed the Lords almost upon the throne of the Almighty; having raised them thus high by his adulatory blasphemy, he invokes them to imitate that benignant being; to imitate the justice, beneficence and wisdom of that Being, and to say to her Majesty, the Queen, "GO AND SIN NO MORE!" And this is an advocate! This

is a *Solicitor-General*! This is a man who, in the words of the dying warrior, tells his companion: "in this *glorious and well-foughten field*, we have kept together in our *chivalry*." The poor bungling thing does, indeed, put in, in the way of parenthesis, an assertion that this case *is unlike* that in which Jesus Christ humanely extricated the harlot from the clamours and peltings of her hypocritical accusers; but, still, these are the words that he puts into the mouth of the Lords; these are the words in which he calls upon them to dismiss her; he invokes them to *imitate* that Benignant Being, and to say to the Queen, "go **AND SIN NO MORE!**" It is very curious, but it is perfectly true, that an address, intended to be presented to the Queen, was shown to me, before being presented, and that it contained *these very words*, with just such a qualification, or saying clause, as is here made use of. I pointed out to the writer the inevitable interpretation that it would receive, and gave him, as my opinion, that, qualify the thing how he might, the *bare use of the words* would be an insult to her Majesty. He had the good

sense to perceive the error, and the further good sense to strike out the passage; and here I find it again staring me in the face at the conclusion of a two-days' harangue in defence of the Queen.

This close is a pretty fair specimen of the whole. Here are a parcel of quotations got together. With the exception of the malignity against the people, the servility towards the people's enemies, and the impiety and blasphemy against God; with the exception of these, here we have all the characteristics of barrenness and feebleness of mind, puerility and pure childishness. Here we see the school-boy prompted and tricked off for show by the sanctified, gormandizing and mercenary master. Here he is, with his string of quotations; his "dew-drops from the lion's mane," his "well-foughten field," his "sword of Heaven;" and, at last, he comes out

with his "go woman and sin no more." Some people say that *Mr. Denman* is *honest*. It may be so; but who will swear as much for those who set him to make this defence! These things will not escape the Attorney and Solicitor General of the King. They will not neglect to give method to their analysis and their argument. They will not be diverted from their points to run about after "foughten-fields" and "lions' manes." They will not call upon the Lords to imitate God, by telling the Queen to "go and *sin no more*." They will find other texts of scripture better suited for their purpose. They will call upon the Lords *to pass the Bill*; and all that we have to do is to wish that they may labour no more effectually for accomplishing their object than *Mr. Denman* has laboured to prevent its accomplishment.

WM. COBBETT.